

The LENINIST

July 1 1986 30p

Party matters p.3

NCP & Militant p.4&5

South Korea p.6

Class War Prisoners p.8

34



BEHIND THE REPORT of the Eminent Persons Group, behind the EEC's 'joint strategy', behind the clamour for British sanctions against South Africa from the leaders of the Alliance and the Labour Party is not humanitarianism but the fighting determination of the masses in Crossroads, Soweto and Alexandra, and the existence of a profound revolutionary situation.

A growing section of the establishment fears that unless Botha is whipped into carrying out far reaching reforms by sanctions, the whole of southern Africa will be dragged into a conflagration. The state of emergency and increased repression, they insist, will only quicken the slide towards full-scale civil war. This would totally disrupt the economy and destroy the value of all foreign investments in South Africa.

But why doesn't Botha junk apartheid?

The reason is nothing as simple as Boer pig headedness and ingrained bigotry. The fact is the dominant tendency in the South African bourgeoisie feels itself caught between the devil of revolution and the deep blue sea of revolution. It recognises that reform is a necessity. Yet it realises that reform could get out of control and lead to the very revolution the reform measures were designed to avoid. Getting rid of apartheid could lead to revolution, but then not getting rid of apartheid could lead to revolution. This is the conundrum that splits the South African ruling class.

Thus as well as calling for Mandela to renounce violence and for 'ANC nationalists' to 'join the political process' Botha has been forced by the logic of apartheid's crisis to take measures which flatly go against all the talk of dialogue and reform.

Botha said he ordered the

imposition of a state of emergency because the revolutionary movement was planning to use the 10th anniversary of Soweto to establish popular power in key black areas. He also said the revolutionary youth, the street delegates known as the comrades, were becoming integrated into the MK and were being trained by them. Botha is prepared to risk imperialist displeasure, even sanctions, simply because the revolution is breathing down his neck.

How did this come about?

Junior imperialism

South Africa's position as a junior imperialist rests on a fragile internal colonial order and the super-exploitation of the black majority. This meant that when world capitalism slid into economic instability in the 1970s it produced an increased relative impoverishment of the black masses, which then became absolute. The impoverished, politically excluded masses had nothing to lose. The masses were not prepared to be ruled in the old way.

But the rulers could no longer rule in the old way. Not only did they have mass discontent on the one hand but on the other world economic stagnation. If South African industry was not to become totally uncompetitive, if the country was to avoid being reduced to one simply producing raw material for the imperialist heartlands, apartheid had to be radically restructured.

But far from easing social and economic contradictions, the reforms acted like fissures through which mass discontent found expression. The anger of the masses exploded.

The revolutionary situation begun by the uprisings in Soweto,

Guguletu, Mannenburg and other townships in June 1976 has not been ended by Botha's draconian 'law and order' measures, the Black Hundreds style terror of the witdoeke vigilantes or the pacifist pleadings of the South African Council of Churches. In fact the counterrevolutionary terror has forced the revolutionary movement to toughen up their organisations, learn the art of combining legal with illegal work and seriously confront the task of arming the masses.

No wonder the great imperialist powers have become so concerned about human rights in South Africa. Of course for all the talk about the evils of apartheid from the likes of Reagan, Kohl, Mitterrand, Chirac, Nakasone and Thatcher what they are really concerned about is protecting the interests of capitalism in South Africa from the black masses themselves.

Without swift reform they warn of the danger of a social as well as a political revolution in South Africa. As Dr Zack de Beer, a director of the giant Anglo American Corporation, said of his fellow South African big capitalists: "We all understand how years of apartheid have caused many blacks to reject the economic as well as the political system." (*Financial Times* June 10 1986).

So the imperialists, along with many South African capitalists — who were for so long content to accrue massive profits because of apartheid — are now doing their best to persuade Botha to opt for reform. But because the objective conditions in South Africa make reform an unviable project for both rulers and ruled the leading imperialist powers are also suffering from a sort of crisis of policy when it comes to South Africa.

Leaving apartheid as it is will lead to revolution but then reforming apartheid could end in the very same way. Imposing sanctions might or

might not push Botha towards reform, but then they might simply encourage the South African bourgeoisie to opt for fascism, and a 'final solution'. Whatever the result sanctions would be economically damaging to both South Africa and the imperialists.

Britain in particular, because South Africa is its 12th largest export market (1984 exports R1.1bn, imports R2.4bn), because between 7% and 10% (£12bn) of its foreign investment is there, because its capital is increasingly undynamic and even senile, fears — despite the Commonwealth's EPG, Owen, Steel and Kinnoch — doing anything meaningful over South Africa.

Workers' sanctions

Some elements in our communist movement think we can usefully aid the revolution in South Africa by supporting the EPG and appealing to Thatcher and Reagan to side with the liberation movement by imposing imperialist sanctions.

We take a different approach. We look to the class struggle in Britain. We look to the example of the Hands Off Russia campaign back in 1920 which saw the working class itself impose sanctions.

It has lost none of its relevance. The 'persuasion' of the Hands Off Russia campaign was supported by the formation of Councils of Action, mass rallies, and direct action, not least the famous blacking of the Jolly George. Such militant 'persuasion' forced the government to retreat.

We should learn similar 'persuasion' when dealing with Thatcher. She is sure to understand such 'persuasion' far better than any convoluted cant about Britain's honour and standing in the international community. We

all know that Thatcher and the class she serves do not give a damn about the horrors of apartheid. What matters to them is making sure that the profits made from South Africa's workers keep flowing into the coffers of Britain's transnational industrial corporations and bloated banking empires.

We must see government sanctions as a by-product of a mass anti-apartheid campaign, not as the central aim.

Direct solidarity is what is needed. This means drawing into the anti-apartheid fight a whole spectrum of the population from doctors to black unemployed youth. But at the core of any serious strategy must be the action of the organised working class. Such action could have a real impact on the Botha regime but also its most important backer Britain — our main enemy.

This means paying more than ritualistic tributes to the Dunnes strikers in Dublin, it means making their action the inspiration for a mighty strike wave against apartheid and its British imperialist backers.

The struggle of the South African masses could be greatly assisted by direct solidarity. This should not be doubted. South Africa is dependent on foreign imports in a whole range of key areas. It is therefore very vulnerable to workers' sanctions. As Oliver Tambo has argued workers' sanctions would have a great political impact. The South African masses yearn to feel the warmth of international workers' solidarity as they face a new wave of apartheid terror and repression.

If for no other reason we should spare no effort for the heroic masses in South Africa because the overthrow of apartheid would rock a shaky British imperialism to its rotten foundations.

Jack Conrad



The New Reality

COMRADE PETE CARTER'S new pamphlet, *Trade Unions: the new reality*, has been launched with much hullabaloo by our Party's leadership. Its contents and main proposals are of course well known because the pamphlet is based on a report made to the Executive Committee in March 1986. It criticises the old broad lefts, argues for trade unionists to accept the role of the law in industrial relations and calls for unions to take a lead in taking up 'green' issues and popularise themselves through sponsoring marathons and pop concerts. Essentially though the report was made in reaction to the miners' Great Strike and its militant tactics.

At the heart of Carter's thesis is the need to win public sympathy, to make unions acceptable to the middle classes and avoid frightening off potential Labour votes through militant actions. Carter believes the NUM under Scargill did not do this.

We Leninists disagree with comrade Carter on the Great Strike and above all on the long term future of trade unions. We say the miners were militant but not militant enough. They needed revolutionary leaders not left reformist ones.

There can be no question of ignoring public sympathy for workers' actions. What we do recognise though, is that public sympathy comes when the workers are strong, it should be seen as a by-product, not the main tactical aim as it is for Carter.

More than that, we understand the inherent limitation of trade union politics. We understand that the sectionalism Carter complains of, the narrowness of trade union struggle, the problems of racism and sexism can only be overcome by winning the working class to accept communist leadership.

The fact is that only genuine communists can develop a scientific strategy for socialist revolution and only such a strategy can win workers to overcome their sectionalism and realise themselves as a class.

Do comrade Carter's politics have any value?

Terry Marsland maintained in the *Morning Star*: "The statement made by the Industrial Organiser is the meandering of an individual who has neither the understanding of the serious industrial and political issues we have to address ourselves to, now and in the future, nor the status within the movement to be taken seriously."

Nonetheless almost at the very moment of the pamphlet's launch in Scarborough John Edmonds, newly elected leader of the General Municipal and Boilermakers' Union, was speaking about the need for his union to recognise the new reality of industrial relations and gain support from the public through sponsoring fun runs and pop concerts.

Clearly Carter's politics have some use to the mainstream of Labourism. But how about workers in struggle?

Again around the time of the launch of Carter's pamphlet it was announced that printworkers had resoundingly voted to continue their struggle for jobs and union recognition at Wapping. In doing this the printworkers were, it must be said, rejecting the PR version of industrial struggle — advocated by Carter. Implicitly they voted against the half-hearted demonstration, the fatal TUC guidelines and faith in victory through a consumer boycott by Mr and Mrs Average Tory working class *Sun* readers and Mr and Mrs Average middle class *Tory Times* readers. The result of this style of approach advocated and praised by comrade Carter was inevitably ineffective.

But Carter's politics are dangerous, not irrelevant. The main aim of these politics is to make the unions compatible with the new Kinnockite grey image of the Labour Party. In other words unions must be made to look and be safe. This is suicidal in the midst of struggle against job cutting bosses, backed by baton-wielding thugs in blue and the full might of the Tories' anti-union laws.

While the Carter recipe is just the ticket for Kinnock, and the right moving labour bureaucracy, the rank and file, and not just those at Wapping, need such an approach like a hole in the head. Those in struggle have no choice, they must use the most militant of tactics or go down. This is the lesson of the Great Strike and it is the lesson of the Wapping dispute.

The Editor

Six months subscription rates: Britain and Ireland £5; Europe £8; Rest of World £10 (airmail £17.50).

Annual subscription rates: Britain and Ireland £10, Institutions £20; Europe £16, Institutions £26; Rest of World £20 (airmail £35). Institutions £30 (airmail £45).

Back copies: Issues 1-6 (theoretical journal) £1 each plus 25p p&p. Issues of paper (from issue 7) 30p each plus 10p p&p.

All cheques payable to November Publications.

Correspondence to: The Editor, BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX

Printed by: Morning Litho Printers Ltd. (TU), Unit 5 St. Marks Industrial Est., 439 North Woolwich Road, London E16 2BS.

Published by: November Publications, BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX © World copyright July 1986

LETTERS

Ireland

This year the Irish Freedom Movement's national demonstration will be held on 9 August — 15 years to the day since the introduction of internment without trial in Northern Ireland.

Today internment continues under a different name. Any Irish nationalist in the North can be picked up on the word of a paid perjurer and interned for up to three years without a trial.

Trials in the Northern Ireland context are little consolation — with no juries, Loyalist judges, and supergrasses whose evidence is used to convict up to 48 nationalists at a time.

If the Irish are to have justice we must first ensure that every British gunman and jailer is withdrawn from Ireland. The demands of the IFM demonstration in August are Troops Out of Ireland! Prisoners out of Jail!

Yours fraternally
Fiona Foster

Scotland

I commend you on your willingness to allow a debate on policy in your columns. It is a welcome change from normal practice, and the issue is of considerable strategic importance.

1. We seem to be working from the same premises: the Stalinist position on the National question advanced in *Marxism and the National Question* and later defended by Lenin. Our differences come in how to apply this to the present conjuncture.

2. On the three questions raised in my last letter, I take it from your reply that your answers would be yes, no, no. A Scottish workers' republic would be desirable but is not feasible and advocating it interferes with gaining a British workers' republic, which is more desirable and more feasible. In defence of this you argue that the national question does not have mass support in Wales and Scotland unlike Ireland so that a Scottish right to self-determination is currently hypothetical. I argue that your assessment is empirically incorrect and your policy in practice opposes the Stalinist line on the national question and ends up tailing English and Irish national chauvinism.

3. You correctly state that no revolutionary crisis has arisen in Britain since 1920. Marxist politics is based upon foresight, hypotheses about the likely course of social development. We can advance three alternative hypotheses about political evolution in Scotland: a) a workers' revolution in UK as a whole occurs prior to crisis on national question; b) national question crisis comes first, separate Scottish bourgeois state established; c) national question crisis first but national struggle led by workers' movement leads to Scottish workers' state. You presumably think that (a) is most likely. I would order the alternatives (b,c,a) in terms of likelihood.

Evidence: Contrary to your claim (which may be valid for Wales) all available evidence indicates overwhelming support for Home Rule or independence in Scotland; majority support in devolution referendum, growth of support for SNP, *Scotsman* MORI poll in March showed 47% for home rule with substantial powers plus 33% for total independence with only 14% supporting the present constitution. The party of the all UK bourgeoisie has sunk to 3rd place in the elections two weeks ago.

The national question is coming to a head very rapidly. Not since

Irish independence has the constitution enjoyed so little support in one of the nations of the kingdom. It is not a hypothetical question, nor will it wait till the workers' revolution in the UK as a whole. As communists operating here we have to deal with it and fight for the most revolutionary outcome of the crisis: a workers' republic. The only realistic alternatives are a devolved assembly along the lines of Stormont (Labour, Liberal and CP policy), or an independent Scottish Kingdom (SNP policy). Should we really go along with the CP line of an all party alliance for a devolved parliament? What do you advocate in this situation? You claim to support the right of peoples to self-determination, but have yet to condemn the UK government for denying that right following the devolution referendum.

4. On both Scotland and Northern Ireland I am arguing a Stalinist line. As has been shown by BICO in painstaking detail, the Ulster Scots who make up the majority in NI meet all Stalin's criteria for nationhood. They have repeatedly and democratically expressed a wish to remain in the UK. That right is not recognised by the Irish state which has pursued an irredentist claim against them. You now tail Irish state propaganda with the claim that this is "against the will of the majority of the Irish people". This is an atrocious argument for Marxists to adopt. You have shifted the criteria for the right to self-determination from the wishes of the people concerned, to the claims of a neighbouring state. On this basis you can justify the irredentist claims of any state on the territory of its neighbours.

Whatever else your criteria is, it is neither Marxist nor democratic. Its practical application leads to just what you accuse *Vanguard* of promoting: bitter fratricidal conflict within the working class.

It reaches a climax in your front page article "Ireland Will Win" where you abandon all pretence of fighting for a class line and adopted a purely nationalist slogan. You criticise those on the left like *Militant* and *Morning Star*, who share some of your bourgeois nationalist views but who shrink from the appalling anti-working class conclusions that they lead to. But you seem very unwilling to engage in serious debate with those like the BICO and myself who openly defend the Stalinist line, a line that attacks the common ground between yourself. *Morning Star* and the Trots.

P. Cockshott,
Scotland

Jack Conrad replies:

We will in the future present our views in full on the national question in Britain. Therefore this reply should be taken as a contribution not a definitive position.

Nations are living, evolving communities of people which can diverge as well as converge, as communists are confident they ultimately will. Nations are historically constituted communities formed on the basis of common experience, territory and culture.

The Irish nation evolved from Celtic tribes and Danish and then English feudal invaders, as well as later Scottish and English settlers of the early 17th century. Far from these elements being loosely connected they slowly merged. Generation after generation difference in language, economic life and culture diminished so that by the 19th century they were of secondary importance.

The Scottish nation evolved from Picts, Scots (from Ireland), Danes, and Angles. Like Wales it was throughout the middle ages in danger of being annexed by the more powerful England. Only the struggles led by William Wallace and Robert

Bruce secured an independent Scotland with the establishment of the Stuart dynasty.

But in 1603 the Scottish Stuart king James VI became James I of Great Britain. This speeded up the process of convergence between the nations of England and Scotland which had already begun. Over the next three centuries or so, English and Scottish (and Welsh) culture drew together and formed a British nation.

Because we accept Lenin's theory on the national question we recognise that national considerations are subordinate to international considerations. This means in general we fight for the unity of nations against separatism. In light of this the merging of the English, Welsh and Scottish nations was historically progressive.

Far from developing Ireland British capitalism raped it. More than that the growing conservatism of the working class in Britain during the latter half of the 19th century rested on Ireland's subjugation. Thus a free Ireland, Irish separation from Great Britain, would have been progressive for Ireland and Britain. For these internationalist reasons Marx and Engels supported the Fenian petty bourgeois revolutionaries.

The partition of Ireland, rather than recognising the existence of two nations, as comrade Cockshott would have it, resulted from Britain's determination to continue to dominate all of Ireland, something it facilitated by the alliance it consolidated with the labour aristocracy based on the Protestant descendants of Scottish and English settlers.

It is possible that two nations could evolve in Ireland. This could take place on the basis of say the expulsion of the 40% of those in the Six Counties who are Catholic. But this is hypothetical. There is only one (divided) nation in Ireland today, albeit with religious and historical differences exacerbated by British imperialism's partition of the country.

Irish unity and independence would be a blow against British imperialism and could open the door to socialism in Ireland and Britain. It is therefore the internationalist duty of communists to support Irish national liberation.

If Ireland is the exception against the general position against separatism, Scotland and Wales are the rule. They are both still in certain ways distinct nations. Welsh is spoken as a first language in the north and Scotland has its own legal system. Nonetheless they are also part of a British nation which is still evolving. Wanting home rule is not the same thing as wanting separation. It would be dishonest to suggest they are. Of course we must fight for the Scottish and Welsh people to have more democratic rights, just as we must do for the people of London and Britain as a whole. But while communists in England have a duty to fight for the democratic rights of the Scottish and Welsh nations, fight for their right to exercise self-determination if they wish, communists in Scotland have a duty to inculcate a fraternal spirit of unity between English, Welsh and Scottish workers. Narrow national separation can only weaken the class struggle in Britain not strengthen it. International considerations must come first.

Note: Letters have been shortened due to lack of space. For political security we have changed names and addresses, and certain details.



WRITE TO:
The Editor
BCM Box 928
LONDON
WC1N 3XX

The saga of Motion 7

ON APRIL 28 the *Morning Star* carried a report under the banner of 'Turkish Workers' Amnesty Call'. It made a series of blatantly untrue allegations about the Union of Turkish Progressives in Britain, the Committee for Defence of Democratic Rights in Turkey and others.

Despite phone calls, an editorial in *The Leninist* and numerous letters, no explanation has come from the *Morning Star* why it did not check the facts, no protest letters have been printed and no reply by the editor has been sent. Why is this? Why has the *Morning Star* suddenly become quiet? Why doesn't it grant a right of reply? The facts are these:

- A group of people, including members of the UTPB were physically attacked outside Stoke Newington Town Hall on the evening of April 26. They were selling copies of *Workers' Voice* (*İşçinin Sesi*), distributing May Day leaflets as well as Labour Party local election leaflets. The provocative attack was staged by the supporters of the 'Turkish Community Centre' (*Halkevi*) who had organised a rally in the town hall. The attackers were armed with clubs and far outnumbered the UTPB group. They objected to the presence of the UTPB members and were determined to drive them away from outside their event. After sustaining injuries the UTPB fought back sending the *Halkevi* stewards packing.

- The police were called. Although it was obvious that two groups had clashed, that injuries were suffered by both sides they immediately arrested two members of the UTPB pointed out by *Halkevi* members.

- Almost instantly the *Morning Star* carried a report accusing the UTPB of staging an unprovoked attack. The *Morning Star* slandered the Communist Party of Turkey — *Workers' Voice* and lied about the CDDRT.

- The *Halkevi* group, dominated by the 'official' Communist Party of Turkey, went to the Stoke Newington police (notorious for their hostility to black and ethnic minorities). They presented themselves as 'moderates', non-political people who had been subjected to an attack by leftists. They then gave the police the names of leading members of the UTPB, Union of Turkish Workers and Union of Turkish Women, who were then arrested.

- The *Halkevi* group, whose chairman is a factory owner, went on to collaborate with the police in holding identity parades inside local factories, thus attempting to intimidate Turkish workers and exposing them to the danger of deportation.

- Ten people have been arrested so far — including one woman. Some are Labour Party members and all are leading activists in various community organisations and one is currently on trial in Turkey, in his absence, accused of slandering the Turkish state abroad.

- When the defendants were arrested, (in one case by ten officers in three vehicles in the early hours of the morning), material was confiscated by the police without proper receipts including May Day placards and political newspapers. Defendants were also subjected to racist jokes and remarks directed against "communists", "extremists" and "agitators".

Like the police, the *Morning Star* has apparently decided to take sides with a group who came to Britain with the avowed intention of fighting those they see as political enemies no matter what damage is done to solidarity work in support of the working class in Turkey. A group who are using the same tactics as they used with such damage in



Those who use the police against their opponents have no place in the workers movement

Turkey prior to the 1980 coup.

The *Morning Star* seems to have given its blessing to those who collaborate with and use the police in their struggle against their political opponents in the workers' movement, who endanger the security of political refugees and Turkish migrant workers in Britain, and are in favour of splitting the solidarity work with the peoples in Turkey. This should be of the greatest concern to every PPPS shareholder. It should also provide food for thought for members of the Communist Campaign Group who still suffer under the illusion that the *Morning Star* is edited by 'principled communists'.

The fact that neither the UTPB or the CDDRT have been given answers as to why the *Morning Star* has given its services to such a foul campaign against them is a disgrace. It is equally disgraceful that supporters of the *Morning Star*/CCG ensured that Motion 7 submitted by Hackney Trades Council to the PPPS AGM was withdrawn. It simply called for the editor or the Management Committee to give a verbal report to the AGM on the accuracy of the April 28 report. But this was too much for the Chaterites.

After a frantic mobilisation they cobbled together a five vote majority at the poorly attended June meeting. Even then they had to lie through their teeth to justify the motion being withdrawn. "Only one letter of protest had been received", "no one knows what really happened", "the

majority in the Turkish community supported the attack on the UTPB and the CDDRT" and even that the trades council "shouldn't take sides". Could not Mary Rosser have told shareholders this, could they have not judged the facts for themselves? Interestingly the Glasgow sectional meeting was held before Motion 7 could be withdrawn. Mary Rosser was therefore forced to say something on the question. What did she say? "We have made our position clear". Indeed you have Mary, you have sided with opportunists who use the police.

Understandably the Chaterites prefer to bury the whole issue. But we must not let them get away with lying and supporting the police and those who use them for factional reasons. We ourselves remember only too well the calling of the Stoke Newington police on young communists, seven of whom were black, by Doug Chalmers who was then General Secretary of the Young Communist League.

A sordid attack has been mounted by the police and a 'left' group with no revolutionary honour against those fighting for socialism and democracy in Turkey and the rights of migrant workers in Britain. An attack which can only help the enemies of democracy in Britain and Turkey.

If the *Morning Star* is, as it claims to be, the paper of the left in Britain, then it must give the UTPB and the CDDRT an explanation or the right of reply.

Why no reply?

The Editor,
Morning Star
75 Farringdon Road

28th April 1986

Sir,

My attention has been drawn to an item which appeared in today's *Morning Star* (28th April) under the heading "Turkish workers' amnesty call". In the course of this item your anonymous reporter writes: "The *Workers' Voice* group ... sponsors the Committee for Defence of Democratic Rights in Turkey."

At one time the CDDRT had the support of many MPs and British unions, but most have withdrawn their backing over recent years."

All I can say is that is news to us, and is a downright lie, as a glance at our headed paper or activities reported in our monthly Turkey Newsletter will show. We have as sponsors 65 MPs and MEPs, some 50 trade union organisations and numerous Labour Party organisations and individuals.

The CDDRT which is the oldest and broadest campaign in support of the peoples of Turkey in Britain has an elected General Council and Executive Committee. On both of

these ruling bodies the majority are members of the British Labour Party; — which is not, as far as I know, "an ultra-left group expelled from the Turkish Communist Party".

As for the violent incident mentioned, reports coming into our office today speak, on the contrary, of men armed with sticks coming out of the hall and attacking paper sellers and women handing our leaflets in support of a Labour Party candidate in the local elections.

We are amazed that your paper should unquestioningly support those who are trying to split the work of solidarity with the working people of Turkey and are conducting a vendetta of lies and distortion against this committee.

We hope this is a case of the *Morning Star* being misinformed and that either a retraction of the lies about the CDDRT, or this letter, will appear in your columns.

Yours sincerely,

Max Hiron
General Secretary

So far no reply has been received to this letter.

When Spain went to the polls on June 22 the ruling Socialist Party was challenged from the left by the Izquierda Unida (United Left). This Izquierda Unida was a left reformist electoral platform seeking to build on the 7 million votes obtained by the anti-NATO referendum coalition on March 12. It united the Eurocommunist-led Communist Party of Spain under comrade Gerardo Iglesias and the 'pro-Soviet' Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain led by comrade Ignacio Gallego. Around these two parties a host of assorted greens, ecologists and small petty bourgeois radical groupings were gathered. Excluded from Izquierda Unida is the former PCE general secretary, comrade Santiago Carrillo. He sarcastically dismissed the alliance of Euros and centrist 'hardliners' as a "gazpacho"; the Spanish soup made from mixed vegetables. In contrast another former prominent leader of the PCE, the civil war hero, Enrique Lister, has decided to rejoin. His 'Spanish NCP', the Communist Workers' Party, which split after the 1968 Czech events, dissolved itself and its members are now working under the discipline of the PCE.

In keeping with its usual method the *Morning Star* has not reported the fact that Graham Atkinson has been sacked from his position as an industrial reporter. Nor is it reported that the NUJ is fighting his case. Atkinson, it will be remembered, went onto Channel 4's *20/20 Vision* programme to tell all about how, when on assignment for the *Morning Star* in Bulgaria, he was approached by Bulgarian comrades and told of a plot to snuff out a defector from the Soviet Union. He had, Atkinson was informed, been specialising in fingering Tudeh Party members for Khomeini's butchers. Atkinson was offered money to help track down this worm. But not being content to say 'thanks, but no thanks comrades', he went onto Channel 4 and told all. Is Atkinson still a member of our CPGB? If so comrade McLennan should take a leaf out of Tony Chater's book — at least on Atkinson. Expel him now.

Finland now has both a Euro and a CCG type

Communist Party. The Eurocommunist leadership of the 'official' party, the SKP, under its chairman Arvo Aalto, is determined on a 'historical compromise' with the bourgeois parties. To achieve this comrade Aalto fought to eliminate the centrist opposition which controlled eight of the SKP's 17 district organisations. He countenanced the establishment of parallel Euro organisations in these districts. After dropping the idea of taking the whole matter to the bourgeois courts the centrists around the paper *Tiedonantaja* rebelled. Although the Finnish 'CCGers' *Committee of the Finnish Communist Party Organisations* is not officially a party, it has elected its own central committee, its own chairman, comrade Taisto Sinisalo, and its own general secretary, comrade Jouko Kajanoja. As a result there are likely to be two separate congresses next year. As to elections, a spokesman of the Euro SKP is reported to have said "The new group cannot be accepted on the register of associations using the name of the Communist Party of Finland. It will have to establish a party under another name". For the "moment however, the SKP will not start legal proceedings against the minority for using the name of the SKP." It seems our Finnish comrades, of both tendencies, are sorely tempted to develop their commitment to bourgeois institutions and norms from the parliamentary road to socialism to the court room ideological struggle.



In the middle of last month our fund stood at £539. So we're well on target to achieve our £600 monthly fighting fund and make up for the short fall in last month's emergency appeal. But we said there was no room for complacency. We asked you to give generously. You did. As we went to press we had received a total of £1,071. We offer our hard pressed supporters and readers our heart felt thanks. But when one task is completed another must be faced. Our Summer Campaign has begun. During its three month duration participants will aim to raise a minimum of three weeks income for *The Leninist*. This is the sort of self sacrifice needed to reforge our CPGB and build the revolutionary vanguard the future demands. We urge our readers to join our campaign — see if you can squeeze three weeks from your pay packet, student grant, dole cheque or pension by the end of September. It won't be easy but it can and must be done.

THE REVENGE OF

IT WILL NOT JUST be Neil Kinnock, Roy Hattersley and their chums who will be chuckling and evilly rubbing their hands together over the success in expelling Merseyside *Militant* supporters. The New Communist Party and its paper the *New Worker*, has also adopted a line in favour of the purge of *Militant* and must now, we presume, be as pleased as punch that Kinnock is having success in throwing leftists out of the Labour Party.

There is a scene in Michael Jackson's video *Thriller* where a young couple are faced by a gang of zombie flesh-eaters who have decided to go 'walkies' and who shuffle closer to their prey, dropping rotting bits of themselves along the way; being confronted by a few *New Worker* sellers can be a similar experience. Like the walking corpses of the *Thriller* video the NCP to all intents and purposes is dead, but simply won't lie down. So does it really matter that they have this vile position? After all, this particular little sect has been giving off foul rightist stench for quite some time now. But we believe that it is in fact very important for communists to understand why the NCP has ended up backing the bosses' wing of the Labour Party: very important indeed.

Lining Up

There are two groups in the British working

class movement that adopt a line on the purge of *Militant* in the Labour Party that is markedly out of step with the rest of the radical and revolutionary left. The Revolutionary Communist Party's refusal to defend *Militant* against the right's onslaught arises out of this group's congenital sectarianism and their farcical 'mass party' strutting. For them, the internal affairs of the party of "pink Tories" is of no concern to the "party of the future", as this is the year, apparently, that the RCP "take on the Labour Party". (Our money is on the Labour Party)

The New Communist Party on the other hand, do not simply refuse to condemn the purge launched by the Labour right; they actually shamefully line up with Kinnock, Hattersley and the open agents of the bosses in the Party and advocate the expulsion of the mild-mannered lads and lasses of the *Militant* tendency! In a way, it is hardly worth polemicising with the decrepit weary-minds of this organisation. Since the comrades who went on to found *The Leninist* were expelled in 1980, this organisation has been on a definitive course to the right and shed influence and members at a rate of knots. Unfortunately however, the majority of the opposition in the Communist Party remains politically dominated by the same brand of opportunism that dictates the NCP's rightist impulses: that is, centrism. So it is instructive to look at the farce that is the New

Communist Party and its scab position in order to serve as a stark warning to comrades in the opposition, particularly around the *Morning Star*, which is in essence no different politically to the living dead of the NCP.

On top of this centrism the NCP in fact reflects in an odd way the historical dilemmas of the left of the Labour Party. Subordinated as they are politically to social democracy in the form of the Labour Party in Britain, both *Militant* and the NCP have the best interests of "their" Party at heart. Inside the Labour Party this leads to *Militant*'s embarrassingly craven capitulation before the right's attacks in the interests of "Party unity". The NCP however is organisationally independent of the Labour Party but politically reliant on it, and with a historical grudge against Trotskyism, ends up backing the purge. Odd? No, not really ...

Diktat

On one level, it was predictable that the NCP's juices would start to flow the moment the Labour right started to get heavy organisationally with its helpless *Militant* victim. When the expulsions started to come, when *Militant* defendants were denied any semblance of justice (workers' or "natural") at the kangaroo court hearings set up to try their cases, and even when *Militant* paper-sellers were subjected to actual physical violence by some of the thugs of the Labour right, the NCP must have been lapping it up.

For the NCP, politics is about bureaucratic diktat and arbitrariness. Taking their lead from their closet pin-up boy, Joseph Stalin, they have solved every political problem or disagreement that has ever raised its head in their little sect by anti-democratic, organisational methods. They split originally from our Communist Party, taking many fine comrades, without even one honest article or polemic indicating their course. The decision to split in the first place was a hurried response to the threat of the leadership of the Party to "reorganise" (read "disappear") Sid French's Surrey district power base and expose his factionalism at the Party's congress in November 1977, not as the organisational culmination of a protracted period of struggle in the realm of ideology.

When opposition tendencies began to pop up in the New Communist Party itself, the leadership moved swiftly to ensure its dwindling membership was insulated from anything as dangerous as political debate or controversy. Thus, in December 1979, comrade John Chamberlain, along with most of the NCP's leading young members, was expelled for the heinous crime of having political differences. Subsequently comrade Chamberlain and others went on to form the initial nucleus of our group.

On this superficial level then, it is hardly surprising that the NCP have got the hots for the bureaucratic atrocities of the right wing of the Labour Party; it must remind them too much of their own practice not to raise smile at least. But there is more behind the NCP's support for giving the *Militant* tendency the chop than simply admiration for the strong arm tactics of the witch-hunters.

Tailism

It goes without saying, of course, that the dusty sages of 'Marxism-Leninism' in the NCP consider it a point of principle to tail behind all the positions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This type of politics, given the harsh new world we are living in, is sliding into crisis rapidly. On this level therefore, the dinosaurs of the NCP stand (just) as a grim, episodic monument to the degeneration, and now obvious signs of disintegration, of our

world movement. Without a firm principle to stand on and given the pressures of bourgeois society however, the NCP attempts to balance slavish sycophancy to our Soviet comrades with a thoroughly rotten, tailist approach to the party of the venal labour bureaucracy in Britain, the Labour Party.

At its second conference, the NCP decided that it wanted to affiliate to the Labour Party. 'Fair enough', you may say, 'a legitimate Leninist tactic.' Tactic yes, but when the NCP made this tactic its key strategic demand for the future, they were in fact signalling to bourgeois society that they were tired of trying to be communists out in the big wide world. They wanted to come in from the cold and nuzzle down at last in the warm expansive arms of social democracy. They now even attack the political record of our Communist Party starting from day one, for they claim it was 'sectarian' of us to even stand candidates against the Labour Party from the very beginning of the CPGB's existence. Their turgid pamphlet *For Communist Unity*, that desperate attempt to break out of isolation by making unprincipled and shoddy overtures to the Communist Campaign Group, attacks "the wrong electoral policy adopted by the Communist Party of Great Britain" from its foundation. (p.6)

Today, the NCP wants 'unity'. What type of 'unity'? The type of 'unity' a corpse has with the worms; the "unity in the working class [which] can best be helped by coming to terms with the fact that the Labour Party is the mass-based political party of the working class." (*Ibid*) In other words, let's 'come to terms with' death. Communists have to avoid this type of unity like the plague.

So the NCP loves the Labour Party and hates Trotskyites. But then what is Trotskyism? As we have pointed out, since its self-imposed isolation from the world communist movement, Trotskyism has either degenerated into impotent leftist sects à la Spartacist League or has in essence become the left wing of the very social democracy that the NCP abhors so much. A letter from AEH Doncaster in the March 14 issue of the *New Worker* makes the fairly obvious point:

"From what I have read of the aims of the Labour Left and members of *Militant*, they would appear to have similar political, social and economic objectives."

So what is the real difference between Dennis Skinner and Derek Hatton? Obviously, not very much. So why, pray, back the purge?

'The Trots ...'

For the lifeless *New Worker*, printing a letter about anything is a fairly rare event in itself. I would be stretching a point somewhat to say that there has been a 'debate' in its pages (there have been, in fact, two letters with replies so far but when we are dealing with the walking dead of the NCP, we have to grasp at straws to polemise against. It is useful however because the more that this sect can be squeezed into coming out with its position on the purge, the easier it is for communists to complete the job of their burial, and to really pack down the earth on them this time to make sure they do not even go walk-about again.

A letter from John Davies of Neath, in South Wales, makes the strong point:

"Your attacks on *Militant* through the *New Worker* must bring joy and whole-hearted support from the press, Tory Party and the right wing of the Labour Party."

The reply to this criticism reveals just how scandalously right-wing the NCP has become. It lists the frankly awful positions of the *Militant* tendency:

- The fact that they label the PLO



NCP General Secretary supports...

THE LIVING DEAD

"terrorists"

- That they play down the struggle for peace and for democratic rights generally.
- Their vicious anti-Sovietism.
- Their support for the counterrevolutionary Solidarnosc.
- The fact that they condemn the Irish republican movement.

And they conclude from all this:

"Comrade Davies, this is only the tip of the iceberg of the case against *Militant*. Clothed in revolutionary phrases and deceptively calling for some socialist objectives, *Militant* is essentially anti-working class."

We accuse the New Communist Party of playing the scandalous role of the left cover for the witch-hunt of *Militant* by the scab Kinnock and the pro-imperialist right of the Labour Party! You should be branded with infamy in the workers' movement for such a position, NCP! For is Kinnock attacking and proscribing *Militant* members for their support for the *Solidarnosc* reactionary movement or for being too anti-Soviet for his taste? Has he thrown Mulhearn, Aitman and Lowes out of the Party for their anti-Provo position on the Irish war? Or course not! The purge is part of Kinnock's drive to illustrate to the bourgeois establishment that the Labour Party is sufficiently moderate and pro-capitalist to be trusted with power; a drive that the NCP is now objectively aiding.

The 'genuine' Left

One beneficial effect of the purge will be, according to the *New Worker*:

"... with the pseudo-left out of the way, the authentic Left in the Labour Party will emerge with greater prominence." No more will decent socialists in the Labour Party be "... diverted into support for the posturings of a sectarian clique." The intellectual dunderhead, NCP General Secretary Eric Trevett, lauds "the genuine elements in the labour movement such as the left MPs" and expresses horror that they could be "(lumped) together with the *Militant* Tendency" by the Communist Party Executive Committee (*New Worker*, March 14).

Now we find this idea of an 'authentic' and 'illegitimate' left of the Labour Party an intriguing idea. After all, as AEH Doncaster pointed out, and as we have shown in previous issues of this paper, there is no real difference between the cravenly reformist *Militant* and the rest of the reformist Left of the Labour Party, apart from the fact that *Militant* are better organised and rather more dynamic than the others. In reality however, the NCP's support for the purge of left social democrats out of their beloved Labour Party has a hidden purpose.

As we have pointed out, the NCP believes the key task for communists is to fight for "the working class ideology of Marxism-Leninism to take root in the Labour Party," in other words they want to affiliate and be in there where the smell of governmental power is. So they actually admit, rather grudgingly, that the politics of *Militant* are not "automatic" grounds for expulsion. No, what has got the NCP's goat is the tendency's "existence as a secret and exclusive party within Labour" and it is that which "merits their expulsion". They purse their thin little lips and sneer peevishly:

"If these Trotskyites were honest, they would have left the Labour Party years ago rather than waiting for their perfectly constitutional and well-deserved expulsion." (Editorial in *New Worker*, February 28)

So they make a big point out of the fact that *Militant* "[operate] contrary to Labour Party rule, with its own discipline and funding" (*New Worker*, March 14), because according to the *New Worker*, *Militant*'s "allegiance", unlike the NCP's of course, is not to the Labour Party, but to this vague, nebulous entity "Trotskyism".

So the key point to understand is that the New Communist Party's support for the witch-hunt of socialists out of the Labour Party is fulfilling, in a different way, the same type of exemplary role that Kinnock's purge is designed for. The creepy NCP is signalling to the Labour Party leadership that if they were ever magnanimous enough to let them affiliate, they guarantee that they would give them absolutely no trouble whatsoever, ('Honest guv ...'). Of course, under some circumstances a communist organisation may indeed find it necessary to work in the Labour Party, in much the same way as the Communist Party did through the National Left Wing Movement in the 1920s. Such is the NCP's abject prostration before Labourism however, they would consider such a proposal to be *treachery*.

Ambiguous

It may be argued that we are in fact using a rather large polemical sledge to break the small, crusty old nuts of the 'New' 'Communist' 'Party', but the whole issue of the purge of *Militant* is an important one for the entire workers' movement and the NCP's attitude is extremely telling for Leninists in the Communist Party. Firstly, the reason why it is happening in the first place is as part of a drive by right-wing social democracy to tailor the Labour Party to the political contingencies of the capitalist crisis. In doing so, the irrelevance and impotence of the left of British social democracy, Labour Party included, is being graphically illustrated. This is not simply an abstract, academic phenomenon for communists, however: the fact that the Labour Party dominates the workers' movement dictates that the purge of *Militant* has implications far wider than simply for the Labour Party. Therefore, our position of critical defence of *Militant* against the right expresses our perspective of the importance of the political independence of the working class. Second, the scab position of the NCP should stand as a stark warning to some comrades in and around the Communist Campaign Group who regard the NCP as being 'alright' politically.

In truth the *Morning Star* adopts a more ambiguous position on the purge than the NCP rightists, but nevertheless like them, it too has as its central concern the welfare and 'unity' of its precious, precious Labour Party:

"Labour leader Neil Kinnock yesterday plunged the Labour Party into its biggest constitutional crisis for over 60 years ..." it whimpered when he insisted on pressing ahead with the purge, sparking a walkout by seven lefties from the Labour Executive (*Morning Star*, March 27).

They criticise Kinnock not for being a scabbing, right-wing bastard as we have — they simply occasionally bemoan his "failure" to be a good socialist (as if he could be anything else apart from a pro-capitalist creep) and criticise his "inept handling" of the whole *Militant* affair. Although in an editorial of February 26, they advise that "expulsions are no answer to the problem presented by *Militant*," nowhere do they actually come out and positively defend the hapless Trots against the ravaging of the rabid right-wing. This is because, like the NCP, the *Morning Star* farcically defines *Militant* as "ultra-left" and denounces the fact that it doesn't play fair with Mr Kinnock due to its "conspiratorial approach". Therefore the *Star* advises different tactics to the right of the movement to deal with the *Militant* 'problem'. If any CCG supporter has read this article and has been shocked by the awfulness of the position of the NCP, I'm afraid, comrade, you have nothing to be smug or superior about: although the *Star* does not openly back the purge launched by the

Kinnockites, the difference between it and the NCP is one of degree.

Underpinning both groups' outlooks is a dog-like loyalty to social democracy, even in its rightist form as embodied by Kinnock. For according to the *Star*, he is simply "not committed to achieving socialism": in fact, he is fully committed to maintaining capitalism, isn't he? After all, with the same logic one could say that Thatcher is "not committed to achieving socialism", the transition period of the dictatorship of the proletariat which ends with the flowering of communism. But then, such a description does tend to miss the *essence* of her political world view, doesn't it?

Trophobia

For decades, communists have avoided debate or any contact with Trotskyites whatsoever. Although the Trotskyites were never correct, their criticisms of us were given a certain strength by the fact that we ourselves abandoned fundamental positions of revolutionary communism to them — world revolution, the need to smash the state, the whole notion of uninterrupted revolution — which the Trotskyites then claimed as their own. The emergence of *The Leninist*, however, put paid to all that nonsense: an important component part of our struggle has been to reclaim such ideas

for the world communist movement and rescue them from the distortions they have suffered at the hands of the Trotskyite sects.

Trophobia, however, lives on in our Party. Who can forget Fergus Nicholson's famous definition of Trotskyism as "the handmaiden of fascism" in a PPPS AGM a few years ago and the Straight Leftist denunciation of poor old mild mannered Ernie Roberts MP as a 'Trot'? But now, as in the case of the NCP, Trophobia is beginning to serve a different function than it did in the past. Today it is being used as a signal to the official leadership of the labour movement of just how tame, toothless and corrupted these groups have become and how little trouble they would cause the likes of Kinnock if they were ever allowed to snuggle up to him in his Labour Party. We dare the toothless wonders of the NCP to take up the challenge of this article and try to defend their scabbing! For we Leninists defend *Militant* precisely because we still have a full set of teeth: hard, strong and very, very sharp teeth. Just reach out and feel, NCP ...

Alec Long

REINSTATE ALL THOSE EXPELLED!
DENOUNCE THE NCP CONNIVANCE
WITH KINNOCK!
MORNING STAR OFF THE FENCE!
DEFEND MILITANT
AGAINST THE PURGE!



...Kinnock and his witchhunt



■ "It is worth noting that two sources, who are quite clearly our friends, are saying that war-hardened veterans amongst their photographic staff who have been in Belfast and Beirut are refusing to go on assignments in case they are assaulted by the Metropolitan Police" — so said Colin Sutton, Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, to divisional superintendents.

■ Gerry Healy and his particular WRP seem set to continue the high standards of recruiting the cream of working class youth that they set with their old Young Socialist organisation. Leaving a Wapping demo one night, Leninist comrades were entertained while waiting for their train by the spectacle of three such youthful members of the vanguard 'creaming' (as the Sparts would say) one of London Underground's notoriously uncooperative chocolate dispensing machines. But don't eat them all at once lads: it'll give you a bad case of the dialectics, or as we call it in The Leninist 'the Libyan Trots'.

■ The Socialist Workers' Party is currently campaigning for a special fund of £10,000 and making quite a push for it. Of course, this organisation claims a membership of some 4,000, so this financial appeal works out at about £2.50 for each SWPer, or to put it into terms probably more appropriate for the SWP, considerably less than one evening's drinking.

■ A sticker currently being handed around by some printers and their supporters on the Wapping demonstrations has the shock/horror headline "6000 sacked by an American" who is also apparently "investing his profits in AMERICA", not in dear old Blighty, the despicable cad. This of course, is the type of chauvinism and identification with 'our' country and 'our' industry that cripples workers' struggles. Communists fight such poison, but not so the Morning Star. On May 28, it ran a headline on its front page which read 'Hop Off Murdoch', which presumably the lunk heads at the Star believe to be a clever dig at the fact that Murdoch is originally Australian. 'Harmless journalistic sweep', some supporters of the Star and Communist Campaign group might say. But comrades, did you ever stop to think about the problems that might arise if Murdoch had been Black, an aborigine for example? The path of national chauvinism, once you step foot on it, is a slippery slope. And you cannot say you have not been warned...

KOREA



1986 HAS seen a marked upsurge in opposition in South Korea to the rule of dictator Chun Do Hwan. The number of protests, rallies and confrontations with the police has increased sharply, particularly from February onwards, but the significance of this period cannot be reduced simply to the scale of protest. As important, and in some ways more important, is the fact that what we can observe in South Korea in the current phase is a process of qualitative development of the opposition, in regard to the nature of the demands put forward, the social groups being drawn into the struggle, and a willingness to use whatever means might be necessary.

The Chun dictatorship came to power in the aftermath of the assassination of previous President, Park Chung Hee, in 1979. Opposition to Chun was vigorous, and was violently suppressed. Park's assassination, apparently by one of the regime's own men, came at a time of growing unrest and revolt directed against political repression, economic deprivation, and the alliance between the Korean bourgeoisie and Japanese imperialism. This unrest continued after the fall of Park, culminating in an uprising in the city of Kwangju in May 1980, which was put down in an orgy of violence by the military, ordered by Chun. Popular resentment to the regime in general, and to the way in which the military acted in Kwangju, has simmered beneath the surface in Korea throughout the Chun years.

American imperialism has not been unaware of this, and has taken care to foster its own safe, pro-imperialist opposition in South Korea. During Carter's administration, the Democratic Party, on a ticket of supporting human rights, opted for one Kim Dae Jung as 'their man'. Kim had stood against Park Chung Hee in the rigged elections of 1971 which were part of a process through which Park sought to 'civilianise' and legitimise his dictatorial rule.

Despite graft, intimidation and plain old ballot rigging, Kim came very close to winning, far too close, in fact, for the US to cold shoulder him completely. Kim stood on a straight bourgeois democratic ticket, calling for Western-style democracy for a country where the economic basis for such an option simply does not exist. A specifically Korean twist to Kim's opposition to Park was his utilisation of anti-Japanese feeling, which he has sought to channel into pro-Americanism.

Park Chung Hee had emerged as leader in the 1960s in the aftermath of the overthrow of fiercely anti-Japanese and anti-Communist dictator Syngman Rhee. Under

Park, the South Korean government underwent a rapprochement with Japan, and the Korean 'economic miracle' was constructed on the basis of close cooperation with the economic interests of Japanese and American imperialism.

Korea had been a Japanese colony from 1910 to 1945, and had experienced a particularly repressive and brutal form of colonial subjugation, which has fired resentment and anti-Japanese feeling to the present day, a feeling which genuinely cuts across class lines to some extent. Park had served in the Japanese imperial army, and was wide open to attack on this question. Park came to fear Kim as a rival, all the more dangerous because acceptable, and in some ways perhaps even preferable, to US imperialism, which had been the architect of the Korea-Japan economic and political co-operation. Kim was imprisoned, has been beaten up by the regime's thugs, and was even kidnapped in 1973 when in Japan, as the Park regime tried to kill two birds with the same stone by getting rid of Kim while blaming the incident on North Korea.

Kim has been treated by Chun in the same way that he was by Park. After the intervention of the US, Kim was allowed to leave Korea for medical treatment (i.e. self-imposed political exile) in the US, while still serving a prison sentence for sedition, for which he had been sentenced to death, a sentence which was commuted to life imprisonment, again after US intervention. He returned to Korea to fight in the 1986 elections and was duly beaten up at the airport and placed under house arrest, treatment that was apparently also meted out to the US Democratic Party big-wigs who had accompanied him.

Kim, alongside other explicitly pro-imperialist bourgeois politicians, formed the New Korea Democratic Party (NKDP) in the month prior to the February 1986 National Assembly elections. The NKDP won 29% of the vote, compared to Chun's Democratic Justice Party (DJP)'s 35%. The NKDP since then has stepped up its appeals to the masses in South Korea to support its programme of constitutional reform. Chun's term of office ends in 1988, and the NKDP clearly wants its man, who is most likely to be Kim Dae Jung, to replace him as president. Currently, that would have to be decided by an electoral college dominated by the DJP. Consequently, the NKDP has called for a reform of the constitution whereby the president would be elected by a direct vote by the electorate. Also, in an attempt to cash in on the 1988 Olympic Games which will be held in Seoul, the South Korean capital, they have called for these elections to be held a

year early, in 1987. To these ends an alliance, the National Liaison Organisation for Democratisation, was formed in March of this year, uniting the NKDP and a host of Church-based opposition groups, including the United Minjung (People) Movement for Democracy and Re-unification, which itself comprises 19 civil rights movements, and is headed by dissident Churchman, Rev. Moon Ik Hwan.

This respectable opposition has launched a series of mass rallies, in an attempt to show the strength of opposition to Chun to the US. These rallies have included one at Pusan, where some 40,000 turned out, Cheongju, and Kwangju, where the annual commemoration of the uprising was turned into a rally for Kim and the NKDP. The events which led up to the overthrow of Marcos in February this year in the Philippines were referred to repeatedly by Kim and his allies, so that the US might see its interests as lying in the peaceful transfer of power from one puppet to another without the need for the squalour of the rigged election and public squabbling that accompanied Marcos's fall. In this they were disappointed in two respects.

Firstly, the Reagan administration has remained decidedly cool about the NKDP. When US Secretary of State George Shultz visited Korea in May he made a point of not seeing either Kim Dae Jung, or his even more 'moderate' ally Kim Young Sam, and instead spoke in public of US support for Chun. The Chun regime was moving admirably towards democracy, claimed Shultz, and enjoyed the full support of the US administration in this, and should not be compared with the Marcos regime. Kim's and the NKDP's

miscalculation was based on a misunderstanding of the US support for the 'democratic opposition' in underdeveloped countries. Shultz, far from contradicting the enlightened interests of US imperialism, rather showed a very sophisticated understanding of the objective situation.

The Kim Dae Jungs and the Cory Aquinos of this world offer something they can never deliver, which is why they are both very useful and very dangerous for the bourgeoisie. If the people of a country are on the street in open revolt, then the bourgeoisie will resort to these types as a way of trying to lead popular feeling down the garden path. The Kims and the Aquinos can get the bourgeoisie out of a sticky situation. But there is a big difference between leaning on these types in bad times, and actually fostering their building of a mass movement calling for democratic rights which the bourgeoisie cannot afford. That would be playing with fire. The US will only abandon a dictator if it has to.

Secondly, the protests which the NKDP fostered and supported have developed a momentum of their own. To bring the masses out onto the streets is one thing, to get them to disappear back into their homes when they have got you your limited constitutional reform is quite another. When people are on the streets, actively taking part in the political life of the country, they become receptive to political ideas and political argument. Under these conditions, the contradiction between the democratic rhetoric and the counterrevolutionary intentions of the likes of Kim come to be exposed much more easily. And this is precisely what is happening today in South Korea.

Brian Curran

Umsebenzi

Leninists in the CPGB are doing their best to raise money for the SACP's paper *Umsebenzi*. As has been repeatedly emphasised in this paper our efforts are by themselves merely a token gesture. For that reason we have made, and continue to make, the call for all communists and militant workers to help *Umsebenzi*.

Some blockheads insist against all the evidence of life itself that the SACP, along with the entire world communist movement, is counterrevolutionary. We, on the other hand, prefer to base our judgements and theory on the reality of Umkhonto we Sizwe, and the role of communists in it, the ANC and Sactu.

The reality of the SACP, and its tasks, is the point of reference of genuine Marxist-Leninists. This does not mean tailism. Nor does it mean giving up our critical faculties. Indeed, because in a very real sense the fate of the revolution in South Africa depends on what the SACP does, and does not do, on its ability to be innovative, dynamic and theoretically precise, we consider it our solemn duty to present our criticisms and assessments openly, in the spirit of true proletarian internationalism.

Join our fund drive for *Umsebenzi*. Send your donations to us at BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX.

John McPhee, *The Swiss Army*, London 1985, Faber and Faber, pp150, £8.95.

"COMMUNIST Swiss soldiers keep rifles and machine guns at home. It is said that this is not dangerous for political purposes; it is dangerous only for the wife."

There are many capitalist states in the world, differing in the way the institutions interact and maintain the power of the capitalist class. Such variations are the outcome of material and historical factors influencing how each state developed.

Switzerland is an unusual capitalist state in that there is no full-time army. A standing army is one of the institutions characteristic of a capitalist state, along with a bureaucracy, police force, judiciary, and clergy. In Switzerland, almost all men between twenty and fifty spend ten or more days a year on active service after a seventeen week initial training course. Officers put in more days military service while also retaining their civilian job. Only half of the general staff work in the army full time, mostly in training jobs.

Why has the Swiss state produced such a solution to the need for an army? Its army is completely 'defensive':

"It will attack no one, will participate in no so-called police action, will make no alliance, and will defend itself."

Such an attitude, and the form of army Switzerland has evolved to implement it, could probably only develop in a marginal, wealthy and democratic country with an ability to avoid being pulled into 'great power' conflicts and hard to penetrate, easily defended terrain.

After their initial training, the Swiss soldiers keep weapons, bullets and gas masks at home, and interestingly for those who say an armed people would result in mayhem, the murder rate in Switzerland is remarkably low. So how similar

is it to the armed workers' militias which are needed to establish and defend the dictatorship of the proletariat after the revolution? In form there are similarities but in essence it is not much closer than when British young men had to do national service in the 1950s, since it is Swiss capitalism it is there to defend, and the soldiers are led by officers who are all members of the establishment — "businessmen and bankers... it is not easy for a plumber or a mason to be with the officers... Corporations underwrite the general staff" — which makes plans and forms strategy.

So the Swiss army, like any capitalist army, is a tool of the rich to defend their interests and is run for them by trusted members of the bourgeoisie.

Seventeen weeks of indoctrination may subdue revolutionary spirit latent in the youth, may increase stability in the short term.

However, in the long term, when crisis hits Switzerland and the gun-holding workers refuse to be ruled in the old way, the Swiss bourgeoisie may experience tremendous difficulties due to the democratic armed people structure of its army. In a revolutionary situation it would be a great advantage to say the least, for the revolutionary forces if the workers were armed and the state had no standing army to set against them.

John McPhee is clearly no Marxist, and his book about the Swiss army is purely descriptive with no analysis. It is not even systematic or coherent, anyone who opens it looking for information is doomed to frustration; the facts are inserted apparently at random, in a rambling account of a holiday spent travelling with units of the army on exercises. The important information is patchy and disorganised, given mostly as quotations from unidentified people, and mixed up with a mass of trivial detail. This incoherent style of writing, from someone who teaches writing courses at Princeton University, is described on the cover as "a subtle and entertaining study."

It's not hard to see why CND advocates a Swiss style military system for Britain. The idea of a democratic army, with efficient conventional forces defending a neutral, unaggressive country from any attack or invasion, must be attractive to those who are pacifist at heart and who have not gone beyond the utter idealism of believing that appealing to the humanity and reason of imperialist governments will make them become peaceful. In contrast we Leninists will continue to call and fight for a workers' militia.

Mary Goodwin

Peter Hopkirk, *Setting the East Ablaze*, Oxford University Press, London 1984, pp. 345, £4.50.

WRITTEN with the intention of 'exposing' the Soviet Union's 'ambitions' towards India and China following the Russian Revolution, this anti-communist work actually highlights the extent to which British agents attempted to undermine the first workers' state. One British general bragged that he had "relays of men constantly coming and going in areas which I deemed important. There was hardly a train on the Central Asian railway which had not one of our agents on board, and there was no important railway centre which had not two or three men on the spot."

A flavour of those early revolutionary days can be found: the isolation of the Bolsheviks in the Central Asian republics from the Party's leadership in Moscow produced some excesses against various national groups which Lenin had to fight to overcome. The appeal of the revolution among prisoners of war held in Russia, which led to many thousands of Germans, Austrians, Hungarians and Romanians joining the Red Army, is something which the author just cannot understand.

The reporting of the revolutionary days in Tashkent gives the lie to the argument by reformists that a middle course could have been taken between soviet rule and the most reactionary counterrevolution. When the counterrevolution staged a rising in Tashkent some railway navvies did join in the fighting against the Bolsheviks, but "when it became clear that the new government was royalist and reactionary they quickly changed their minds." This was to prove catastrophic to the counterrevolution in Tashkent.

Those who play the 'only if' game have to explain why it was that the leaders of the counterrevolution butchered reformists and revolutionaries alike. For Marxists the explanation is quite simple: human beings are a product of their society; the more decadent and rotten a society is then so are its human representatives. A short account is given of the reign of terror by Baron Ungern-Sternberg in Mongolia which generally illustrates the fate that awaited Bolsheviks, Jews, reformists, and non-Russians if the counterrevolution succeeded. "Innumerable men, women and children of all ages, races and creeds, were hacked to bits and bayoneted and

目次

第一章 有產者及無產者

第二章 無產者和共產黨

第三章 社會主義及共產主義的著作

第四章 共產黨和在野各黨派關係

共產黨宣言

1921 Chinese edition of the Communist Manifesto

shot and strangled and hung and crucified and burnt alive" for three days following the capture of the Mongolian capital by the Baron's troops.

Fortunately the Baron was defeated by the Red Army and brought to trial. "Hundreds of workers, peasants, soldiers — Russians, Siberians, Mongolians and Chinese — jammed the courtroom. Thousands more stood outside in the street. Many of these people had lived through Ungern's reign of terror. Their brothers, children, wives and husbands had been shot, tortured or hurled into the boilers of locomotives." Baron Ungern was executed by the Red Army on September 15, 1921.

For Britain the big fear was that the Russian Revolution would spread into India, the heart of the empire. In particular, following the Third Afghan War, British agents were instructed "to do everything possible to prevent the consummation of Afghan and Bolshevik plans for an offensive and defensive alliance."

False information was fed to both sides to encourage suspicions, and the Afghan king was encouraged to seek links with Moslems in the Soviet Union rather than with the tribesmen in the Northwest Frontier.

of British India. This first attempt to play the "Moslem card" against "godless communism" has direct links with the CIA backing for the mullah-led forces in Afghanistan today. Despite all the attempts of British agents, communism did begin to permeate India and China, but, unfortunately, the twists and turns imposed by Stalin on the International did much to weaken the infant communist parties, particularly so in China, where Chiang-Kai-shek had many thousands of communists massacred in Shanghai and other towns in the spring of 1927.

In response the local communist leadership in Canton was instructed to lead an uprising on December 11, 1927, despite their misgivings. For three days the ill-armed communists managed to hold out until defeated by overwhelming numbers. Many thousands perished in the bloodbath that followed. With defeats such as these, with their urban leadership dead, their working class supporters massacred, it is understandable why the surviving Chinese communist leadership adopted a turn toward peasant insurrection.

Comrades who have £4.50 to spend might spend it on some more useful work.

Peter Ellis

The Leninist
The Leninist
The Leninist
The Leninist
The Leninist

SPECIAL OFFER

The Leninist
theoretical journal

Nos 1-6 Winter 1981 -
Winter 1984.

Normally £1 each
(plus p&p).

Now only £5 for all
six post free.

BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX

	6 months	1 year
Britain & Ireland	£5 <input type="checkbox"/>	£10 <input type="checkbox"/>
Europe	£8 <input type="checkbox"/>	£16 <input type="checkbox"/>
Rest of World	£10 <input type="checkbox"/>	£20 <input type="checkbox"/>

For more detailed rates see page two

I enclose a cheque/PO for £..... made out to November Publications

Please start my subscription with issue no.....

I enclose a donation for £..... made out to November Publications

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

Return to: Subscriptions, BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the PPPS (the co-op which owns the *Morning Star*) voted by 664 votes to 2,176 against Motion 1, moved by Stan Keable and seconded by Jack Collins of Kent NUM. It read as follows:

"This AGM urges the *Morning Star* to launch a militant and systematic campaign on behalf of all class war prisoners languishing in British jails. Today not only are miners still in prison for fighting for their class during the miners' Great Strike, but there are also hundreds of other political prisoners caged by British imperialism.

● Heroic black youth are imprisoned for fighting back against the racist police force.

● Irish republican prisoners are condemned for fighting for the unity and freedom of their country.

British imperialism systematically uses the prison regime to degrade and dehumanise prisoners. Martina Anderson and Ella O'Dwyer, two Irish women accused of 'crimes' arising from the media and police-inspired 'seaside' bombing conspiracy of 1985 have been subjected to frequent strip-searching and other forms of harassment and torture over a period of months while awaiting trial in Brixton prison. Terry French, a Kent miner imprisoned for fighting for his class recently lost ten days remission and spent three days in a punishment cell for the heinous crime of smuggling a few letters out to his wife.

We must not let the class war prisoners fight alone. We call on the *Morning Star* to launch such a campaign demanding: —

● the unconditional release of all class war prisoners, and
● in the case of the jailed miners, that they are given their jobs back on release."

For any really class conscious worker it would be automatic to vote for such a motion. Yes, this clause could have been formulated better, perhaps more detail should have been included there. But these are technical questions. Even then, if one felt strongly enough it was always possible to put in an amendment.

Yet the fact was this motion was defeated. How could this happen at the PPPS AGM, a gathering of thousands of advanced workers and communists? Well liberalistic followers of *Marxism Today* would have voted against it simply because of its uncompromising militancy. The overwhelming majority at the PPPS AGM, though, were not for *Marxism Today*, they were violently against it.

So why vote against a militant class motion. The reason perhaps lies in misplaced loyalty to the Chaterite majority on the Management Committee and the corrosive effect years of centrism has on principle, even the most basic of principles.

Most of the 2,176 votes cast against the Keable/Collins motion were cast by the *Morning Star* right or wrong loyalists, who still blindly vote the way their leaders call for them to vote. But why should the Management Committee call for such a motion to be rejected?

Amazingly the *Morning Star* Management Committee claimed at the Glasgow sectional meeting it was already doing exactly what the motion was calling for. "The motion was pushing against an open door" said Mary Rosser, "it is already the policy of the paper" she insisted. Of course in London, a couple of days

later, she changed her tune and discovered differences with the "wording" of the motion.

Whatever the case we haven't seen much evidence of the *Morning Star* fighting for class war prisoners. Moreover if it is "already the policy of the paper" why call for the motion to be rejected?

Why not get one of their supporters to amend it then? Why flatly call for its rejection?

The answer is crystal clear — the Management Committee are a bunch of political opportunists who don't have the honesty to openly oppose what they disagree with.

The truth is that they do not, and have no intention of fighting for the unconditional release of all class war prisoners. So committed to the bourgeois legality enshrined in the *British Road*, are the likes of Mary Rosser, that they do not seem even to have any concept of 'class war prisoners'.

Even when it comes to the miners still imprisoned after the 1984-5 Great Strike the *Morning Star* has been dishonest to the point of treachery. It has urged the imprisoned miners should have their appeals considered after the Tories have been defeated at the next general election by a commission set up by a Labour government. Those who are wrongly imprisoned should be released. Therefore the *Morning Star* says to the miners and their supporters give your all for the fight to get Neil Kinnock into No. 10.

As we and the *Morning Star* know, Kinnock took great pride in boasting last year that whatever the TUC or Labour Party Conference may vote for, if he became Prime Minister he wouldn't lift a finger for the imprisoned miners let alone other class war prisoners. A typical display in front of TV and press by a Labourite aspiring to become Prime Minister, ever eager to be seen arrogantly riding rough shod over his own rank and file, ever eager to prove his fidelity to the law of the land and the powers that be. And on this issue who can doubt that Kinnock is telling the truth. After all it was the Wilson Labour government that let the Shrewsbury 2 rot in jail and refused to interfere in the 'due process' of the law.

So the *Morning Star* has done its best to split the issue of freeing miners in jail and the reinstatement of those sacked. After all it does not want anything to get in the way of Neil Kinnock's passage to glory at the next general election. Instead of pointing to the example of the militant strike action which succeeded in releasing the Pentonville 5 under a Tory government, or Marx's championing to the Fenians and how he helped to organise a massive 100,000 strong demonstration in London on their behalf, the *Morning Star* perpetuates the transparent lie that "the next Labour government" should be the source of all our hopes and the central aim of all our struggle.

Now if the imprisoned miners get this hypocritical treatment from the *Morning Star* what hope is there for campaigning for the unconditional release of the black youth imprisoned after fighting heroically the hated police? Little to none. Again the *Morning Star* will offer blacks in general the reformist nostrum of "the next Labour government". Conveniently forgetting Labour's role in introducing immigration controls, forgetting its racist record every time it has been in government. Will a Labour government under Kinnock be any different?



Class war prisoner: Terry French — Kinnock won't free him but militant action can

FREE ALL CLASS WAR PRISONERS

Only a fool would think so, only a congenital opportunist would say so.

As to the Irish freedom fighters the *Morning Star* has simply branded IRA volunteers 'terrorists', joining the British state's vitriolic hate campaign against the liberation movement. For the *Morning Star* the Irish liberation movement has gone beyond the pale simply because it is fighting within the British state and not thousands of miles away like the ANC. For Mary Rosser to say that the *Star* is fighting for the hundreds of Irish freedom fighters incarcerated by Britain, or even that the Management Committee only has technical objections to the motion calling for a militant campaign on their behalf is a bare faced lie as has

been shown by the *Morning Star's* 'factual' reporting of the so-called Brighton bomb trial. The *Morning Star* does not defend the killing of British troops in the Six Countries, or the blowing up of the British Cabinet, and does not fight for the unconditional release of those captured by the British authorities.

We in contrast say that whatever 'crime' class war prisoners have been convicted of, whatever tactics they have felt compelled to employ, whether they are innocent or 'guilty', the working class movement has a sacred duty to defend them, be they South Wales miners, young Brixton blacks or IRA or INLA volunteers from Derry. We must fight for their unconditional release and on this elemental demand not an inch must

be given.

That the Keable/Collins motion was voted down by a margin of about 3:1 is a disgrace. It certainly says a lot about the continued hold narrow factional leaders have over the rank and file whose gut reaction would have led them to vote for rather than against such a motion. Of course that it gained 664 votes against the recommendation of the Management Committee (and the 'hard line' 'pro-Soviet' sect *Proletarian*) shows that there is, thank goodness, a wide body of opinion, in and around our Party, which will stand on a basic working class principle.

This is a basis from which to build.

David Sheriff

Class War Prisoners' Aid

THE International Class War Prisoners' Aid (British Section) came into existence in December 1924. It was fully backed by the Communist Party and its first secretary was the well known communist Wal Hannington.

One of its most active campaigns was that in defence of the American anarchists Sacco and Vanzetti, who were eventually executed. The ICWPA rallied mass support demanding their release.

The freedom of prisoners of British imperialism especially those fighting for the liberation of India and Ireland was of particular concern for the ICWPA. Under its auspices Jim Larkin, the great leader of the Dublin proletariat, spoke alongside the CPGB MP Shapurji Saklatvala and other Party leaders to meetings up and down the country. As a result Saklatvala was

able to present parliament with a petition demanding the release of all class war prisoners which contained 300,000 signatures.

In October 1925 12 leading CPGB members, including JR Campbell, Willie Gallacher, Albert Inkpin, Harry Pollitt, Bill Rust, R Page Arnot, and Wal Hannington were arrested. The 12 were charged with incitement to mutiny because the CPGB had called upon "all soldiers, sailors and airmen to refuse under any circumstances to shoot down the workers of Britain."

And within a few weeks of the imprisonment of the 12, another directly political trial commenced in Cardiff. 167 anthracite miners were charged with offences resulting from their militant strike in July and August 1925.

It was clear that the ruling class

was determined in the run up to the General Strike to decapitate the working class of its best leaders. The ICWPA launched a massive campaign in solidarity with the 12 and the miners.

Conferences were organised throughout the country. Weekly marches of up to 15,000 descended on Wandsworth Prison where the 12 were held to demand their freedom. And when finally seven of the 12 communist prisoners were due for release 20,000 rallied outside the jail to greet them and demand the immediate release of the remaining five.

Today with militant miners like Dean Hancock, Russell Shankland and Terry French languishing in jail, with hundreds of black youth and Irish republicans locked up, a new ICWPA is a desperate necessity.